

On the role of vector mesons in topological soliton stability

Abdellatif Abada, Dimitri Kalafatis* and Bachir Moussallam

Division de Physique Théorique†

Institut de Physique Nucléaire, 91406 Orsay Cedex

** and LPTPE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie,*

4 Place Jussieu 75252 Paris Cedex 05 (France)

Abstract

Isospin one vector mesons (in particular the ρ) are usually described as massive Yang-Mills particles in the chiral Lagrangian. We investigate some aspects of an alternative approach in the soliton sector. It is found that the soliton is stable in very much the same way as with the ω -meson and that spontaneous parity violating classical solutions do not exist. The formulation in terms of antisymmetric tensors is shown to be canonically related to a vector field description provided the Skyrme term is added to the latter.

IPNO/TH 92-83

October 1992

† *Unité de Recherche des Universités Paris XI et Paris VI associées au CNRS.*

I. Introduction

During the last ten years, a great deal of effort has been devoted to the study of baryons as topological solitons of nonlinear meson theories. This possibility emerged a long time ago in the pioneering work of Skyrme [1]. Later, the connection between solitons of meson theories, and large N_c expansion of QCD [2] was established [3]. Low-energy baryon phenomenology was considered in Ref. [4]. In this model the effective Lagrangian is based on the nonlinear σ model and an antisymmetric term of fourth order in powers of the derivatives of the pion field (the so-called Skyrme term) is added in order to avoid soliton collapse [5].

It was soon realized [6], that the Skyrme term can be thought as a large mass (local) limit of a model with ρ -mesons. Similarly ω -meson exchange generates a term of order six. These findings provided the ground for the construction of a more general effective Lagrangian, which includes the low lying mesons and considerably improves the predictions for baryon physics [7]. An important question is that of soliton stability in the presence of vector mesons. The ω field, was shown to yield stable solutions in Ref. [8]. But this was not the case of the low-lying isovector-vector mesons (and the ρ in particular), which were introduced as hidden gauge particles [9] as well as massive Yang-Mills [10] fields, and in both cases the soliton was shown to be unstable, contrary to earlier claims [11]. This different behaviour of the ρ and the ω -mesons may look surprising as their local large mass limits are both stabilizing the soliton.

Now, in another context, the role of meson resonances in chiral perturbation theory was investigated by Ecker et al. [12]. In that paper, isovector mesons are described in terms of antisymmetric tensor fields (first proposed in Ref. [13]). They

are introduced in the chiral Lagrangian following the standard prescription of nonlinear chiral symmetry for massive particles [14]. It was shown in Ref. [15] that this approach is equivalent to the hidden symmetry (or Yang-Mills) one to $O(p^4)$ in the chiral expansion.

The purpose of this letter is to examine whether the introduction of the ρ -meson in this alternative approach could play a different role *in the baryon sector*. We will focus our attention then to soliton stability in such a model. Particular attention will be given to the similar role that the ρ and the ω fields are finally playing in soliton stability.

The Lagrangian is introduced in section II. Soliton solutions of winding number one are then constructed in section III. We study the classical stability of these solutions in section IV. We finally discuss some issues on the vector field approach in section V.

II. The model

Compared to the conventional way of introducing isospin-one vector resonances in the chiral expansion, the method of Refs. [12,13] has one basic difference: the assumption that the resonance fields *are not* gauge bosons of any kind. They are simply assumed to transform as $R \rightarrow h(\pi)Rh^\dagger(\pi)$ where h is defined from the transformation property of $u = U^{1/2} : u \rightarrow g_L u h^\dagger = h u g_R^\dagger$ such that $U = \exp(i\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}/f_\pi)$ transforms linearly. It proves convenient (see sec. V.) then to describe spin one mesons in terms of antisymmetric tensor fields $W_{\mu\nu}$. The following Lagrangian ensures that only three physical degrees of freedom actually propagate [12] and is the simplest one compatible with chiral symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\pi\rho} = & -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(\nabla^\mu W_{\mu\nu}\nabla_\sigma W^{\sigma\nu}) + \frac{M_\rho^2}{4}\text{Tr}(W_{\mu\nu}W^{\mu\nu}) \\ & + \frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\text{Tr}(\partial_\mu U\partial^\mu U^\dagger) + i\frac{G_\rho}{2\sqrt{2}}\text{Tr}(W_{\mu\nu}[u^\mu, u^\nu]) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where,

$$\nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + [\Gamma_\mu, \cdot], \quad \Gamma_\mu = \frac{1}{2}(u^\dagger \partial_\mu u + u \partial_\mu u^\dagger), \quad u_\mu = i(u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - u \partial_\mu u^\dagger) \quad (2)$$

It was shown in Ref. [12] that the low-energy constants L_1, L_2, L_3 (from which the Skyrme term derives) and L_9 (related to the pion e.m. radius) are saturated to a very good approximation by the resonance contribution from Eq. (1)

Another important feature of the theory that Eq. (1) defines, is its close resemblance with the ω -stabilized model. It is easy to observe that the canonical momentum conjugate to the space components of the antisymmetric tensor field vanishes identically: $\pi_{ij} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\pi\rho}}{\partial [\partial_0 W^{ij}]} = 0$. This means that the components W_{ij} of the resonance tensor field are constrained. To gain more insight into the problem, we go through the algorithm of constrained dynamics [16], and find that the conservation in time of the primary constraint leads to:

$$W_{ij} = \frac{1}{2M_\rho^2} \left\{ -i\sqrt{2}G_\rho[u_i, u_j] + \nabla_i \pi_{0j} - \nabla_j \pi_{0i} \right\} \quad (3)$$

These frozen fields are the ones which couple to the static soliton field. Anticipating on the next section, let us only observe that because of Eq. (3), W_{ij} cannot be trivially set to zero, as a naive variational study of Eq. (1) could suggest. This is exactly what happens in the ω -stabilized case [10]. The only difference is that in the present model one would encounter the repulsion of the Skyrme term, while in the ω case it is a sixth order term which is doing the job.

III. Soliton solutions

In terms of true degrees of freedom, the secondary Hamiltonian functional is a function of $\vec{F}$ and its canonical momentum $\vec{\phi}$ describing the pion field, and of W_{0i}, π_{0i} representing the three polarizations of the massive spin-1 ρ field and their respective

momenta. We assume the hedgehog ansatz for the pion, and the most general spherical ansatz for the resonance fields:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{F} &= \hat{r}F, \quad W_{0i} = f_\pi [w_1(\tau_i - (\vec{\tau} \cdot \hat{r})\hat{r}_i) + w_2(\vec{\tau} \cdot \hat{r})\hat{r}_i - w_3(\vec{\tau} \times \hat{r})_i] \\ \vec{\phi} &= \hat{r}\frac{f_\pi^2}{r}\phi, \quad \pi_{0i} = \frac{f_\pi}{r} [\pi_1(\tau_i - (\vec{\tau} \cdot \hat{r})\hat{r}_i) + \pi_2(\vec{\tau} \cdot \hat{r})\hat{r}_i - \pi_3(\vec{\tau} \times \hat{r})_i]\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

At the classical level, the radial functions $F, \phi, w_1, w_2, w_3, \pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3$ are found by extremizing the Hamilton functional which can be written as a sum of two terms:

$$H = 4\pi f_\pi^2 \int_0^\infty dr [\mathcal{H}_Q(F, \phi, w_1, w_2, w_3, \pi_1, \pi_2) + \mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho}(F, \pi_3)]\tag{5}$$

The first piece, $\mathcal{H}_Q$, is positive and *quadratic* in the fields $\phi, w_1, w_2, w_3, \pi_1, \pi_2$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_Q &= \frac{1}{2}(\phi + 2g_\rho w_3 \sin F)^2 + \frac{\pi_2^2}{4} + \frac{\pi_1^2}{2} + (r\dot{w}_2 + 2w_2 - 2\cos F w_1)^2 \\ &\quad + (M_\rho r)^2(w_2^2 + 2w_1^2 + 2w_3^2) + \frac{1}{2M_\rho^2}(\dot{\pi}_1 - \cos F \frac{\pi_2}{r})^2\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

with $g_\rho = 2\sqrt{2}G_\rho/f_\pi$. As long as the fields are nonsingular, it is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{H}_Q$ vanishes in the static limit. We stress that we do not impose the $\phi, w_1, w_2, w_3, \pi_1, \pi_2$ components to be identically zero. We rather find, by solving the static Hamilton equations, that the extremum of $\mathcal{H}_Q$ is met when $\phi = w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = \pi_1 = \pi_2 = 0$. In other words, the possibility of having spontaneous parity violating (SPV) solutions which exist in the Yang-Mills context (in the presence of stabilizing terms [9]), is ruled out here.

The second term in Eq. (5) is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho} &= \frac{1}{2}[(r\dot{F})^2 + 2\sin^2 F] + \frac{\pi_3^2}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2M_\rho^2}\{(g_\rho \sin F \dot{F} - \dot{\pi}_3)^2 + 2(g_\rho \frac{\sin^2 F}{2r} - \cos F \frac{\pi_3}{r})^2\}\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

We now look for static soliton solutions carrying one unit of winding number i.e., satisfying the boundary conditions $F(0) = \pi$, $F(\infty) = 0$ and require $\mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho}$ to be stationary under arbitrary variations of F and π_3 . The set of (two) Hamilton equations that one obtains, can be solved only numerically. We find that there is a solution for the whole range of values of g_ρ . In Fig. 1 we plot such a solution, for $M_\rho = 769$ MeV, $f_\pi=93$ MeV and $g_\rho = 2.1$ (from the ρ width). The classical soliton mass we find is $M = 1140$ MeV, which is slightly lower than the corresponding Skyrmion mass (1220 MeV) that one finds when the ρ mass and the magnitude of the coupling to the pion are increased to infinity, keeping their ratio finite ($e = \sqrt{2}M_\rho/f_\pi g_\rho$). At the classical level the properties of our solution are very close to those of the saddle-point solution of Ref. [11] where the hidden symmetry Lagrangian is used.

IV. Classical stability

The Hamiltonian (Eqs. (6) and (7)) is expressed in terms of *independent* field variables. One should perform arbitrary fluctuations of these, and check whether the classical solution corresponds to a local minimum. In the Yang-Mills approach the classical solutions are destabilized by the fluctuations of positive parity [17]. In our notations these correspond to the components w_1, w_2 (and π_1, π_2) which occur only in $\mathcal{H}_Q$. If one expands $\mathcal{H}_Q$ to quadratic order, one easily sees that the fluctuations of w_1, w_2, π_1 and π_2 as well as those of ϕ and w_3 decouple from the fluctuations of F and π_3 which occur only in $\mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho}$. Thus, the contribution from $\mathcal{H}_Q$ is obviously positive and does not induce any instability.

Let us now turn to $\mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho}$ (Eq. (7)). As a preliminary stability check we performed the following global scaling transformations of the Derrick [5] type: $F(r) \rightarrow F(\lambda r)$ and

$\pi_3(r) \rightarrow \gamma \pi_3(\lambda r)$. We checked numerically that the matrix $\delta_{\lambda\gamma}^2 \mathcal{H}_{\lambda\gamma}$ has two positive eigenvalues, for any value of g_ρ .

Consider now the more general fluctuations $F = F_0(r) + \delta F(r, t)$, $\pi_3 = \pi_3^0(r) + \delta \pi_3(r, t)$ (breathing fluctuations), which are the most dangerous for the stability (see e.g. Ref. [19]). The variation of the Hamiltonian up to second order is :

$$\delta \mathcal{H}_{\pi\rho} = 2\pi f_\pi^2 \int_0^\infty \psi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \psi dr \quad (8)$$

where ψ is a two component vector with $\psi^\dagger = (\delta F \ \delta \pi_3)$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a hermitian matrix operator of the radial variable r , which reads :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{(\delta F, \delta F)} &= -\frac{d}{dr} \left(r^2 + \frac{g_\rho^2}{M_\rho^2} \sin^2 F_0 \right) \frac{d}{dr} + 2 \cos 2F_0 \\ &\quad - \frac{g_\rho^2}{M_\rho^2} \left[\sin 2F_0 \ddot{F}_0 + \cos 2F_0 \dot{F}_0^2 - \frac{\sin^2 F_0}{r^2} (3 - 4 \sin^2 F_0) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{M_\rho^2 r^2} \left[g_\rho \cos F_0 (\ddot{\pi}_3^0 r^2 + \pi_3^0 (9 \sin^2 F_0 - 2)) - 2(\pi_3^0)^2 \cos 2F_0 \right] \\ \mathcal{M}_{(\delta \pi_3, \delta \pi_3)} &= \frac{1}{M_\rho^2} \left[-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + (M_\rho^2 + 2 \frac{\cos^2 F_0}{r^2}) \right] \\ \mathcal{M}_{(\delta F, \delta \pi_3)} &= \frac{1}{M_\rho^2} \left[g_\rho \sin F_0 \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{r^2} (-2 \sin 2F_0 \pi_3^0 + g_\rho (3 \sin^2 F_0 - 2) \sin F_0) \right] \\ \mathcal{M}_{(\delta \pi_3, \delta F)} &= (\mathcal{M}_{(\delta F, \delta \pi_3)})^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Observe that the first two lines in Eq. (9) are nothing but the fluctuation operator of the Skyrminion [18]: this is because the π_3^0 terms as well as the coupling potential generate terms of order $1/M_\rho^4$ or higher.

To prove the stability, one has to show that $\mathcal{M}$ has no negative eigenvalues. We verified this using two different methods

i) diagonalization of a discretized approximation of $\mathcal{M}$: we found only positive eigenvalues

ii) evaluation of the Jost determinant for negatives values of the energy: we found no sign change.

V. Vector mesons in terms of vector fields

Finally, one might raise the question of why is it necessary to resort to antisymmetric tensor fields instead of just vector fields with exactly the same chiral transformation law. To answer that question, let us consider the following Lagrangian of vector fields [15]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_V = & -\frac{1}{4}\text{Tr}(V_{\mu\nu}V^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{M_\rho^2}{2}\text{Tr}(V_\mu V^\mu) \\ & + \frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\text{Tr}(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger) - i\frac{g_V}{2\sqrt{2}}\text{Tr}(V_{\mu\nu}[u^\mu, u^\nu])\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

with $V_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu V_\nu - \nabla_\nu V_\mu$. This Lagrangian differs from the massive Yang-Mills one by $O(V^2)$ terms. Furthermore, vector meson exchange from Eq. (10) can only produce terms starting at $O(p^6)$ in the chiral expansion. In fact, this theory necessitates *explicit* inclusion of the Skyrme term otherwise the Hamiltonian is not positive. Indeed, one finds the following contribution to $\mathcal{H}_Q$ (in the hedgehog ansatz, denoting the radial functions v_i and $\bar{\pi}_i$):

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\phi + 2\sqrt{2}g_V\bar{\pi}_3 \sin F)^2}{1 - 8g_V^2 \sin^2 F / f_\pi^2 r^2} + \dots\tag{11}$$

The Hamiltonian has a pole and is *not bounded from below*. This is clearly unacceptable.

The simplest way to remove the pole is to add to $\mathcal{L}_V$ a local term:

$$\mathcal{L}'_V = \mathcal{L}_V + \frac{g_V^2}{8}\text{Tr}([u^\mu, u^\nu][u_\mu, u_\nu])\tag{12}$$

Furthermore, the Hamiltonian resulting from this operation is equivalent to the Hamiltonian of the antisymmetric tensor field approach. In fact, there is a *canonical* transformation between the two sets $\vec{F}, \vec{\phi}, V_i, \bar{\pi}_i$ and $\vec{F}, \vec{\phi}, W_{0i}, \pi_{0i}$ with $g_V = G_\rho/M_\rho$:

$$V_i \rightarrow -\frac{\pi_{0i}}{2M_\rho}, \quad \bar{\pi}_i \rightarrow 2M_\rho W_{0i} \quad (13)$$

An alternative motivation for replacing $\mathcal{L}_V$ by $\mathcal{L}'_V$ is provided in Ref. [15].

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Profs. R. Vinh Mau and R. Kerner for critical comments and discussions.

References

- [1] T. H. R. Skyrme, Proc. Roy. Soc. A260 (1961) 127
- [2] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B79 (1974) 276
- [3] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B179 (1979) 57
- [4] G. Adkins, C. Nappi and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B228 (1983) 552
- [5] G. H. Derrick, J. Math. Phys. Vol.5 No9 (1964) 1252
- [6] K. Iketani, Kyushu Univ. preprint, 84-HE-2 (1984)
- [7] U. G. Meissner and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 (1986) 1035; Z. Phys. A327 (1987) 5 ; M. Lacombe, B. Loiseau, R. Vinh Mau and W. N. Cottingham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 170 ; Phys. Rev. D 38 (1988) 1491; M. Chemtob, Nucl. Phys. A 466 (1987) 509
- [8] G. Adkins and C. Nappi, Phys. Lett. B137 (1984) 552

- [9] A. Kobayashi, H. Otsu, T. Sato and S. Sawada, Nagoya Univ. preprint, DPNU 91-50, IPC-91-04 ; K. Yang, S. Sawada, A. Kobayashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. 87 (1992) 457
- [10] H. Forkel, A. D. Jackson and C. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. A526 (1991) 453
- [11] Y. Igarashi, M. Johmura, A. Kobayashi, H. Otsu, T. Sato and S. Sawada, Nucl. Phys. B259 (1985) 721.
- [12] G. Ecker, J. Gasser, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 311
- [13] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 158 (1984) 142
- [14] S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. 177 (1969) 2239 ; C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, *ibid* p. 2247
- [15] G. Ecker, J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, A. Pich and E. de Rafael , Phys. Lett. B223 (1989) 425
- [16] K. Sundermayer, *Constrained Dynamics* in Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer-Verlag 1982
- [17] Z. F. Ezawa and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 247 ; J. Kunz and D. Masak , Phys. Lett. B179 (1986) 146
- [18] I. Zahed, U. G. Meissner and U. B. Kaulfuss, Nucl. Phys. A426 (1984) 525 ; A. Abada and D. Vautherin , Phys. Rev. D46 (1992)
- [19] Y. Brihaye, C. Semay and J. Kunz, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 250

Figure caption

The solution extremizing the Hamiltonian functional of Eq. (7). The full line displays the chiral function $F(r)$ in the present model, while the dotted one is the solution of the corresponding Skyrme model. In the dashed-dotted line we display $-\pi_3(r)$, the ρ degree of freedom.